REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated May 25, 2011 (U.S. Patent Office Paper No. 20110519). In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

As outlined above, claims 4, 6, 7, 18-20, and 27-31 stand for consideration in this application, wherein claims 8 and 21 are being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and wherein claims 27-31 are being amended to improve form.

All amendments to the application are fully supported therein. For example, the amendments to the claims are supported by paragraph [0054] of the present application as originally filed, as well as by Figure 5. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Formality Objection

Claim 30 was objected to for a typographical error. As set forth above, claim 30 is being amended to improve form, thereby rendering moot and/or obviating the objection thereto.

Prior Art Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 6, 8, 19, 21, 27-29, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulson (U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0083264) in view of Lee (U.S. Application Pub. No. 2003/0172261). The Examiner rejected claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulson in view of Lee, and in further view of Avraham (U.S. Patent 7,003,620). The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulson in view of Lee, and in further view of Ishida (U.S. Application Pub. No. 2002/0019700). The Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulson in view of Lee, and in further view of Kon (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,838). Applicants have reviewed the above-noted rejections, and hereby respectfully traverse.

A proper obviousness rejection that relies on a combination of prior art elements requires establishing that the prior art references, when combined, teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. MPEP §2143. Furthermore, "[a]ll words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385 (C.C.P.A. 1970). That is, to render a claim obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, a determination must be made that the claimed invention "as a whole" would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art when the invention was unknown and just before it was made. MPEP §2142.

As outlined above, claims 4, 6, 7, 18-20, and 27-31 remain of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Coulson, either alone or in combination with Lee, Avraham, Ishida, and/or Kon, fails to teach, suggest, or disclose each and every limitation of claims 4, 6, 7, 18-20, and 27-31. For example, none of the cited references teach or suggest that "the data of the system region is duplicately stored in both the first and second storage sections" where the first storage section is "formed of flash memories disposed in said casing" and the second storage section is "formed of a hard disk drive disposed in said casing" as required by independent claim 27. In contrast, none of the cited references include any mention or suggestion this required limitation of claim 27. For this reason alone, claim 27 is patentable over the cited references.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Coulson, either alone or in combination with Lee, Avraham, Ishida, and/or Kon, fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each and every limitation of claim 27 and, therefore, that claim 27 is now in condition for allowance. For at least similar reasons to those discussed above with reference to claim 27, Applicants respectfully submit that Sukegawa, either alone or in combination with Kon, Toshiba, Ishida, and/or Coulson, fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the similar limitation of "the data of the system region is duplicately stored in both the first and second storage units" as similarly required by each of independent claims 28-31 and, therefore, that claims 28-31 are also now in condition for allowance.

Moreover, for at least similar reasons to those discussed above with reference to claim 27, Applicants respectfully submit that Sukegawa, either alone or in combination with Kon, Toshiba, Ishida, and/or Coulson, fails to teach, disclose, or suggest any of the similar limitations required by independent claim 29 of "a first storage section formed of flash memories disposed in said casing" and "a second storage section formed of a hard disk drive disposed in said casing" where the first storage section is "configured to provide a first

address space that is allocated with a lower portion of an address space allocated to the storage device as a master drive" and the second storage section is "configured to provide a second address space that is allocated with an upper portion of the address space allocated to the storage device as seen from said host, said second address space being arranged as a slave drive"; and that "upon booting of the computer system, said computer system reads, by way of said ATA controller, data of the system region for booting the operating system from said first address space allocated to the first storage unit formed of flash memories and executes the read data to boot the operating system on the computer system" where "the data of the system region [includes] a master boot record, a file management table, and an operating system" and, therefore, that claim 29 is now in condition for allowance.

Further, for at least similar reasons to those discussed above with reference to claim 27, Applicants respectfully submit that Sukegawa, either alone or in combination with Kon, Toshiba, Ishida, and/or Coulson, fails to teach, disclose, or suggest any of the similar limitations required by independent claim 30 of "a first storage section formed of flash memories disposed in said casing" and "a second storage section formed of a hard disk drive disposed in said casing" where the first storage section is "configured to provide a first address space which is allocated with a lower portion of an address space allocated to the storage device" and the second storage section is "configured to provide a second address space which is allocated with an upper portion of the address space allocated to the storage device as a slave drive"; and that "upon booting of the host, said host reads, by way of said ATA controller, data of the system region for booting the operating system from said first storage unit formed of flash memories and executes the read data to boot the operating system on the host" where "the data of the system region [includes] a master boot record, a file management table, and an operating system." In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references include any teaching or suggestion that "upon a sudden power-off being detected, said source power source monitoring circuit maintains a power source voltage for a predetermined time by using an electric charge accumulated in the condenser, and the control unit operates to store file management data temporarily retained at such sudden power-off into the first storage unit formed of flash memories under the power source voltage maintained by the electric charge accumulated in the condenser" as further required by claim 30 and, therefore, that claim 30 is now in condition for allowance..

In addition, for at least similar reasons to those discussed above with reference to claim 27, Applicants respectfully submit that Sukegawa, either alone or in combination with

Kon, Toshiba, Ishida, and/or Coulson, fails to teach, disclose, or suggest any of the similar limitations required by independent claim 31 of "a first storage section formed of flash memories disposed in said casing" and "a second storage section formed of a hard disk drive disposed in said casing" where the first storage section is "configured to provide a first address space which is allocated with a lower portion of an address space allocated to the storage device" and the second storage section is "configured to provide a second address space which is allocated with an upper portion of the address space allocated to the storage device"; and that "upon booting of the computer system, said host reads, by way of said ATA controller and said control unit, data of the system region for booting the operating system from said first address space allocated to the first storage unit formed of flash memories and executes the read data to boot the operating system on the host" where "the data of the system region [includes] a master boot record, a file management table, and an operating system" and, therefore, that claim 31 is now in condition for allowance.

Where an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 5 U.P.S.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Because claims 4, 6, and 7 and claims 18-20 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 27 and 29 respectively, Applicants respectfully submit that Coulson, either alone or in combination with Lee, Avraham, Ishida, and/or Kon, does not render obvious claims 4, 6, and 7 and claims 18-20 for at least the reasons set forth above that it does not render obvious claims 27 and 29 respectively, and that claims 4, 6, 7, and 18-20 are also now in condition for allowance.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention as claimed is distinguishable and thereby allowable over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, Applicants respectfully submit that certain clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art references upon which the rejections in the Final Office Action rely. These differences are more than sufficient to establish that the present invention as now claimed would not have been anticipated nor rendered obvious given the prior art. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicholas B. Trenkle
Registration Number 54,500

Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

STITES & HARBISON PLLC
1199 North Fairfax Street
Suite 900
Alexandria, VA 22314-1437
(703) 739-4900 Voice
(703) 739-9577 Fax
Customer No. 38327

August 25, 2011

215984:1:ALEXANDRIA